Case	12:12-cv-09835-FMO-FFM Document 1 Filed	111/16/12 Page 1 of 38 Page ID #:1
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	STROOCK & STROOCK & LAVAN LLI JULIA B. STRICKLAND (State Bar No. 0 MARCOS D. SASSO (State Bar No. 2289 A. R. KACHADOORIAN (State Bar No. 22029 Century Park East, Suite 1600 Los Angeles, California 90067-3086 Telephone: 310-556-5800 Facsimile: 310-556-5959 lacalendar@stroock.com Attorneys for Defendants CITICORP CREDIT SERVICES, INC. (USA), and CITICORP	P FILED 083013) 05) 240601) I2 NOV 16 PM 12: 29 CLERK U.S. SISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DIST, OF CALIF. LOS ANGELES BY:
8		
9	UNITED STATES I	DISTRICT COURT
10		CT OF CALIFORNIA
11		
12	BRUCE RORTY,	14-2-098356HK (FFM)
13		NOTICE OF REMOVAL
14	VS.	(Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331.
15	CITICORP, a Delaware corporation; and) DOES 1 through 20,	(Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1441(b), 1446 – Federal Question)
16	Defendants.	
17	}	
18	}	
19	}	
20	}	
21	}	
22		
23		
24		
25 26		
27		
28		
20		
	LA 51600594	

1

3

6

5

7

9 10

11 12

13

1415

₉₈₀217

formia 30067-3

22 23

24

2526

27

28

TO THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1441(b), and 1446, defendants Citicorp Credit Services, Inc. (USA) ("CCSI") and Citicorp (together, "Defendants"), hereby remove the action entitled <u>Bruce Rorty v. Citicorp</u>, et al., Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No. 12C00075 (the "Action"), to the United States District Court for the Central District of California, on the following grounds:

- 1. Removal Is Timely. Plaintiff Bruce Rorty ("Plaintiff") served

 Defendant CCSI with the Summons and Complaint in the Action on October 19,

 2012; Citicorp has not yet been served. This Notice of Removal has been filed within thirty days of service of the Complaint on Defendant CCSI and is therefore timely under 28 U.S.C. § 1446(b). Copies of the Summons, Complaint and

 Amendment to Complaint, as well as the Notice of Case Management Review –

 Limited Civil, Notice of Reassignment to Department A, ADR Information Package, Stipulation Early Organizational Meeting, Stipulation Discovery Resolution,

 Stipulation and Order Motions in Limine and Informal Discovery Conference served on Defendant CCSI in the Action, are attached hereto as composite Exhibit A.

 On November 15, 2012, Defendants filed an Answer to the Complaint, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit B.
- 2. This Court Has Removal Jurisdiction Over This Action. The Action is a civil action of which this Court has original jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and is one that Defendants may remove to this Court pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1441(b) in that Plaintiff alleges violations of the federal Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, et seq. (the "TCPA") (see Complaint,¶ 18), a claim that is created by, and arises under, federal law. See Mims v. Arrow Fin.

¹ It appears that Citicorp is erroneously named. Based on Plaintiff's allegations, the proper entity would be Citibank, N.A., a national bank located in Sioux Falls, South Dakota.

Case 2:12-cv-09835-FMO-FFM Document 1 Filed 11/16/12 Page 3 of 38 Page ID #:3

STROOCK & STROOCK & LAVAN LLP

- Servs., LLC, 132 S. Ct. 740, 748 (2012) (holding that the TCPA's permissive grant of jurisdiction to state courts does not deprive the United States district courts of federal-question jurisdiction over private TCPA suits, and that a TCPA claim, "in 28 U.S.C. § 1331's words, plainly 'aris [es] under' the 'laws . . . of the United States'"). To the extent any other claims in the Action arise under state law, including, but not limited to, Plaintiff's claims for alleged violation of California Penal Code Sections 632 and 637.2, invasion of privacy, and alleged violation of California's Consumer Legal Remedies Act, Cal. Civ. Code § 1750, et seq., supplemental jurisdiction over such claims exists pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1367 and 1441(c).
- 3. No Other Defendants' Consent Is Required For Removal. Defendants are the only two named defendants in the Action, and both join in this Notice of Removal. No other defendants are named in the Action, and therefore, no other entities' consent is required for removal. Accordingly, the Action is properly removed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1446(a) & (b).
- 4. <u>Notice Has Been Effected</u>. A copy of this Notice of Removal is being filed with the Superior Court for the State of California for the County of Los Angeles and concurrently served on Plaintiff.

Dated: November 16, 2012

STROOCK & STROOCK & LAVAN LLP JULIA B. STRICKLAND MARCOS D. SASSO ALEXANDRIA KACHADOORIAN

Ву:

Alexandria Kachadoorian

Attorneys for Defendants
CITICORP CREDIT SERVICES,
INC. (USA), and CITICORP

26

27

28

SUMMONS (CITACION JUDICIAL)

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT: (AVISO AL DEMANDADO):

CITICORP, a Delaware corporation; and DOES 1 to 20

YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF: (LO ESTÁ DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE):

BRUCE RORTY

SUM-100

POR COURT USE ONLY (SOLO PARA USO DE LA CORTE)

CONFORMED COPY

OF ORIGINAL FILED Los Angeles Superior Court

JAN 0 9 2012

John A. Clarke, Executive Officer/Clark

By Lanelle M. Galindo, Deputy

NOTICE! You have been sued. The court may decide against you without your being heard unless you respond within 30 days. Read the information wolad

You have 30 CALENDAR DAYS after this summons and legal papers are served on you to file a written response at this court and have a copy served on the plaintiff. A letter or phone call will not protect you. Your written response must be in proper legal form if you want the court to hear your case. There may be a court form that you can use for your response. You can find these court forms and more information at the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gow/selfhelp), your county law library, or the courthouse nearest you. If you cannot pay the filing fee, ask the court clerk for a fee waiver form, if you do not file your response on time, you may lose the case by default, and your wages, money, and property may be taken without further warning from the court.

There are other legal requirements. You may want to call an attorney right away, if you do not know an attorney, you may want to call an attorney referral service. If you cannot afford an attorney, you may be eligible for free legal services from a nonprofit legal services program. You can locate these nonprofit groups at the California Legal Services Web site (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), or by contacting your local court or county bar association. NOTE: The court has a statutory lian for waived fees and costs on any settlement or arbitration award of \$10,000 or more in a civil case. The court's lien must be paid before the court will dismiss the case. ¡AVISO! Lo hen demandado. Si no responde dentro de 30 días, la corte puede decidir en su contre sin escucher su versión. Les la información a continueción.

Tiene 30 DIAS DE CALENDARIO después de que le entreguen este citación y pepeles legales para presenter una respuesta por escrito en esta corte y hacer que se entregue una copia al demandante. Una carte o una llamada telefónica no lo protegen. Su respuesta por escrito tiene que ester contra y factor al trasporaria por acontra cancer o una familiaria to contra contra trasporaria por acontra cancer o una familiaria de la procesión su caso en la contra contra cancer o una familiaria de la contra cancer o una contra cancer o una familiaria de la contra cancer pera au respuesta. Puede encontrar estos formularios de la contra y más información en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortas de California (www.aucorta.ca.gov), en la biblioteca de leyes de su condado o en la corta que la quede más carca. Si no puede pagar la cuota de presentación, pida el secretario de la corta que la de un formulario de exención da pago de cuotas. Si no presente su respuesta a tiempo, puede perder el caso por incumplimiento y la corta la podrá quitar su sualdo, dinero y bienes sin más advertencia.

Hey otros requisitos legales. Es recomendable que llame a un abogado inmediatamente. Si no conoce a un abogado, puede llamar a un servicio de ramisión a abogados. Si no puede pagar e un abogado, es posible que cumple con los requisitos para obtener servicios legales gratuitos de un programa de sarvicios legales sin fines de lucro. Puede encontrar estos grupos sin fines de lucro en el sitio web de California Legal Services, (www.lewhelpcatifornia.org), en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California, (www.sucorte.ca.gov) o poniéndose en contecto con la corte o el colegio de abogados locales. AVISO: Por ley, la corte tiene derecho a reclamar les cuotas y los costos exentos por imponer un gravamen sobre cualquier recuperación de \$10,000 é más de valor recibide mediante un ecuerdo o una concesión de arbitraje en un caso de derecho civil. Tiene que pagar el gravamen de la corte antes de que la corte pueda desecher el caso.

The i	name	and	address	of ;	the	∞urt	is:
(El n	ombre	y d	irección	ф	ia c	orte e	s):

TAN 0.9 2012

Los Angeles Superior Court, SW District, 825 Maple Avenue, Torrance, California 90503

SB12C00075

A . . A . . A

The name, address, and telephone number of plaintiffs attorney, or plaintiff without an attorney, is: (El nombre, le dirección y el número de teléfono del abogado del demandante, o del demandante que no tiene abogado, es): Bruce Rorty, 1715 Via el Prado, Suite 744, Redondo Beach, CA 90277 (310) 375-0776

(Fecha)	JAN 00 COL	Societario)	(Adjunto)
(For proo (Para pru (SEAL)	of service of this sur	nmons, use Proof of Service of Summons (form POS-010).) Its citation use of formulario Proof of Service of Summons, (POS-010) NOTICE TO THE PERSON SERVED: You are served 1 as an individual defendant. 2 as the person sued under the fictitious name of (specify): 50 3 on behalf of (specify):)).
		under: CCP 416.10 (corporation) CCP 416.20 (defunct corporation)	CCP 416.60 (minor) CCP 416.70 (conservatee) CCP 416.90 (authorized person)
Form Adopte	d for Mandatory Use	SUMMONS	Page 1 of 1

Judicial Council of California SUM-100 [Rev. July 1, 2009]

DATE.

10-19-1202

CONFORMED COP 1 OF ORIGINAL FILED BRUCE RORTY, Los Angeles Superior Court 2 1715 Via El Prado, Suite 744 Redondo Beach, California 90277 JAN **0 9** 2012 Telephone (310) 375-0776 John A. Clarke, Executive Officer/Clerk 4 Plaintiff in pro per By Luncile M. Galindo, Deputy 5 6 7 8 SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES 9 SOUTHWEST DISTRICT 10 CASE NO. \$B12C00075 11 BRUCE RORTY, 12 (Limited-under \$10,000.00) Plaintiff, 13 COMPLAINT FOR: VS. 14 CITICORP, a Delaware corporation; and 1. UNLAWFUL RECORDINGS INVASION OF PRIVACY DOES 1 to 20, 2. 15 3. UNLAWFUL TEXTING Defendants. 16 17 18 COMES NOW, plaintiff Bruce Rorty, ("plaintiff" or "Rorty") and alleges against the 19 defendants, and each of them, the following: 20 Plaintiff resides in Palos Verdes Estates, State of California, County of Los 21 Angeles, and is a residential and mobile telephone subscriber whose residential and cell phone 22 numbers have been called by Citicorp and DOES 1 to 20. Plaintiff's landline and cellular 20 relephone numbers have been registered on the FTC's Do Not Call (DNC) Registry since 24 December 14, 20044 and August 30, 2006, respectively. Plaintiff at no time has ever given 25 Citicorp written authorization to send text messages to his cell phone. 26 Plaintiff is informed and ballower and thereon alleges that at all material times alleged, defendant CITICORP was a Delaware corporation, in the business of banking and extending credit via credit cards to California residents, and maintaining numerous CitiBank SDOC2/44407 -1-

offices throughout California. The terms CitiCorp, CitiBank, and CitiCards are understood to refer to the same corporate entity and are thus interchangeable for purposes of this complaint.

- 3. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thoroun alleges that at all material times alleged, DOE defendants 1 through 20 were and are individuals working for Citicorp who have placed telephone calls to plaintiff in connection with a CitiCard issued to plaintiff.
- 4. The true names and capacities whether individual, corporate, associate or otherwise of Defendants DOES I through 20 are unknown to plaintiff at this time, who therefore sues these defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will seek leave of court to amend this complaint to show their true names and capacities when they are ascertained. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each fictitiously named defendant is responsible in some manner for the occurrences alleged, and that plaintiff's injuries and damages as alleged were proximately caused thereby. Each reference in this complaint to "defendant," "defendants," or a specifically named defendant refers also to all defendants sued under fictitious names.
- 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, dual at all times below mentioned, each defendant was the agent, servant, employee, joint venturer, partner, and/or representative of the remaining defendants; and in doing the things hereinafter mentioned, each defendant was acting within that course, scope and authority as an agent, servant, employee, joint venturer, partner, and/or representative, whether such capacity was actual or apparent, with the knowledge and consent of each other defendant, and as authorized and/or ratified by each of the remaining defendants.
- 6. Plaintiff is informed and believes and therefore alleges that at all relevant times, each defendant acted pursuant to a common plan, and/or aided and abetted the other defendants in the wrongful acts alleged in this complaint, such that each is jointly and severally liable for all harm caused to plaintiff, including that defendants are jointly and severally responsible and liable for the acts and occurrences set out below.
- 7. Whenever this complaint makes reference to any act of a defendant or defendants, the allegations shall be deemed to mean the act of those defendants named in the particular cause of action, and each of them, acting individually, jointly, or severally:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 8. This Court has jurisdiction in this matter pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 410.10, because defendants, and each of them, engaged in violations of the Penal Code as well as the privacy rights granted to California residents under California's Constitution.
- 9. Venue is proper in this Court per Code of Civil Procedure §§ 395 and 395.5 in that defendants, and each of them, by placing multiple collection telephone calls to a Southwest District resident, conducted business within the Southwest District, specifically in Palos Verdes Estates, California, defendants' obligations and liability arose in Los Angeles County, and defendants' breaches occurred in Los Angeles County.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

ILLEGALLY RECORDING TELEPHONE CALLS - PENAL CODE §§ 652, 657.2 (Against CITICORP and DOES 1-20)

- 10. Plaintiff realleges all paragraphs set out above as alleged and incorporates those allegations by reference as if fully set forth.
- ("defendants"), and who did not unilaterally inform plaintiff at the outset of the call or during the call that they were recording the call, nor did they ask plaintiff for his permission to most the call. The call on January 7, 2011 was made by Cynthia Franks, 888-599-4388, ext. 35111.

 Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges defendants were at all times recording the calls. At no time were there any analytic and periodic bears indicating the call was being recorded. At all times plaintiff had an objectively reasonable expectation of privacy, i.e., that the call was not being recorded or otherwise eavesdropped upon. Partway through the January 7, 2011 call, plaintiff asked the caller, Cynthia Franks, if the call was being recorded. The caller responded "yes."
- As a proximate result of the unlawful activities of these defendants, and each of them, per Penal Code § 637.2, plaintiff is entitled to recover \$5,000.00 per recorded telephone call.

SDOC2/44407

12. Per Penal Code § 637.2, plaintiff is authorized to seek an injunction barring defendants, and each of them, from surreptitiously recording telephone calls made to any California resident without their knowledge or permission. This injunction shall include all calls made by all defendants.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

INVASION OF PRIVACY

(Against All Defendants)

- 13. Plaintiff realleges all prographe set out above alleged and incorporate these allegations by reference as if fully set forth.
- 14. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that defendants willfully recorded telephone calls placed to him without his knowledge or permission. This surreptitious recordation violates plaintiff's right to privacy as set out in the California Constitution, Article I, Section 1.
- 15. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges the defendants knew or reasonably should have known that since July 14, 2006 it has been illegal for in-state and out-of-state callers to record conversations with California residences, made to their California residences, unless the call recipient either has knowledge the call is being recorded or gives his or her express permission that the call may be recorded.
- 16. These actions by defendants, and each of them, were despicable, malicious, unlawful, and oppressive, such that plaintiff is entitled to recover punitive damages from defendants, and each of them, in an amount sufficient to punish all defendants and to deter the unlawful conduct. Plaintiff realleges all paragraphs above alleged and incorporates these allegations by reference as if fully set forth.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

UNLAWFUL TEXTING [47 U.S.C §227, CC §§1770(22A) & 1780(e)]

(Against All Defendants)

17. Plaintiff realleges all paragraphs above alleged and incorporates these

SD0C2/44407

-4-

allegations by reference as if fully set forth.

18. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that defendants began sending text messages to his cell phone in Spring 2010 without ever receiving written permission to send text messages. Plaintiff gets charged by T Mobile for each text message. When Claudia called on July 14, 2010 plaintiff specifically told her that he never approved any text messages from CitiCards, and demanded that CitiCards never text him again. But CitiCards texted plaintiff at least once more after July 14, 2010. The text messages violate 47 U.S.C §227, subd. (b) and were done knowingly and willfully, thereby making CitiBank liable for treble damages for each discrete violation of subd. (b). The text messages also violate Civil Code §1770 (22A), making for the recovery of attorney's fees per CC§ 1780(e).

11

12

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

26

27

28

9

1

2

3

4

5

6

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays against defendants and each of them:

FOR THE FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION:

- 1. For statutory damages of \$5,000 per recorded call per Penal Code §632;
- 2. For a temporary restraining order, then a preliminary injunction, and later a final injunction enjoining defendants and each of them from recording telephone calls placed by defendants to California residents at their California residences, unless defendants give notice to the California residents the calls are being recorded, or unless the defendants obtain a California resident's express permission to record the call;
- For reasonable attorney's fees and litigation expenses per Code of Civil Procedure
 § 1021.5;
 - 4. For all statutory penalties available under Penal Code §§ 632 and 637.2;

23 FOR THE SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION:

- 5. For an award of \$5,000 in general damages;
- 6. For an award of special damages, according to proof;
- 7. For an award of \$5,000 in exemplary damages per Civil Code § 3294;

AS TO THE THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION:

8. For an award of \$500 per discrete violation of subdivision (b) of 47 U.S.C. § 227;

SDOC2/44407

-5-

COMPLAINT

and a second	A				
1	9. For an award of treble damages for knowing and willful subd. (b) violations;				
2	10. For reasonable attorney's fees and litigation expenses per Code Civ. Proc. § 1021.5				
3	and Civil Code § 1780(e), in connection with Civil Code §1770, subsection 22A,				
4	relating to texting and "robocalling."				
5	FOR ALL CAUSES OF ACTION:				
6	11. For costs of suit; and				
7	For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.				
8	DATED: January 8, 2012 BROSE BORTY				
9	By: Price Ver				
10	Bruce Rorty, Plaintiff in pro per				
11					
12	DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY				
13	DEMAND FOR TRUMP TO THE				
14	Plaintiff demands a trial by jury.				
15	DATED: January 8, 2012 BRUCE RORT:				
16	By: Jame Lot				
17	Bruce Rorty, Plaintiff in pro per				
18					
19	·				
20 21					
22					
. 23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					
	SDOC2/44407 -6-				
	COMPLAINT				

•		COMPA				
	ASER OF ALTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY STATE BAR NUMBER	OF ORIGINAL PROPERTY OF P				
Bruce Rorty 1715 Via el Prado # 74		OF GRICINALITY OF				
Redondo Beach CA 90277		Los Angeles Superior Court				
310-375-0776	((,,(());=2 \)	Series office on Const				
310-373 0110		OCT 7				
m9 1 m	tt tu man over	OCT 1 8 2012				
ATTORNEY FOR (Name): Plaintif		-land or				
SUPERIOR COURT OF	CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES	to to A. Clarke, Discounts a Officer/Cler				
COURTHOUSE ADDRESS:		Officer/Cler				
825 Maple Avenue, Torr	ance, CA 90503	Ruth				
PLAINTIFF:		By Ti nimites; Deputy				
Sruce Rorty		Journ				
DEFENDANT:						
Citicorp, er al.		·				
ΛMI	ENDMENT TO COMPLAINT	CASE NUMBER				
		S9 12C00075				
	Fictitious /incorrect Name)	1 40 110000.3				
designated the defendant	nplaint, the plaintiff, being ignorant of the true name of the time to the facilities of the facilitie	ne defendant and having				
Doe 1		,				
and having discovered th	a tare name of the defendent in her					
TRUE NAME	e true name of the defendant to be:					
1	vices, Inc. (USA, a Delaware corporation					
amends the complaint by	substituting the true name for the fictitious name wherev	ver it appears in the complaint				
DATE	E OR PRINT NAME SIGNATURE OF ATTORI	HEY (
10-18-12 Brus	ce Rorty					
	ce Rorty (Mul	North				
	······					
INCORRECT NAME (Ord	der required)					
The plaintiff having design	nated a defendant in the complaint by the incorrect nam	no afi				
INCORRECT NAME	inition a deteriorit at the compisint by the incorrect name	ie or.				
,						
and having discovered the	true name of the defendant to be:					
TRUE RAME						
1	,					
amends the complaint by s	substituting the true name for the incorrect name wherev	ver it appears in the complaint				
DATE TYPE	OR PRINT NAME SIGNATURE OF ATTORN	EY VIIII IN THE STATE OF THE ST				
	·					
	ORDER					
HE COURT APPEAR #	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	٠				
HE COURT ORDERS the amer	tument approved and filed.					
Dated		Indiain Off				
		Judicial Officer				
ACIV 105 (Rev. 01/07)	A SAMPANDAMAN					
•	AMENDMENT TO COMPLAINT	Code Civ. Proc., §§ 471.5,				
ASC Approved 03-04	(Fictitious / Incorrect Name)	472 473 474				

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNI	CONFORMED COPY
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES	OF ORIGINAL FILED Los Angeles Superior Court
COURTHOUSE ADDRESS:	
825 MAPLE AVENUE - TORRANCE, CA 90503	JAN 0 9 2012
PLAINTIFF: KOYTY	John A. Clarke, Executive Officer/Clerk
Citicocp.	By Lanelle M. Gallinde, Deputy
NOTICE OF CASE MANAGEMENT REVIEW - LIMITE	
TO THE PLAINTIFF(S)/ATTORNEY(S) FOR PLAINTIFF(S) OF RECOR	RD:
You are ordered to serve this Notice of Case Management Review on confer with all parties/attorneys of record about the matters to be review Review date.	n all parties/attorneys of record forthwith, and meet and wed no later than 30 days before the Case Management
NO APPEARANCE IS NECESSARY. The court will set any future her review. Your Case Management Review has been scheduled as follows:	parings/required actions, based on the case managements:
Date: 5.29-12 Dept	Room #: \OO
	GEMENT REVIEW DOES NOT EXEMPT THE PONSIVE PLEADING AS REQUIRED BY LAW,
Pursuant to California Rules of Court, rules 3.720-3.730, a completed Casmust be filed at least 15 calendar days prior to the Case Management Rejointly by all parties/attorneys of record or individually by each party/attorney	eview date. The Case Management Statement may be filed
The Court may impose sanctions, pursuant to LASC Local_Rule 7.13, C 583.360 and 583.410, Government Code section 68608, subdivision (fallure to file the Case Maπagement Statement, or effectively participate a	(b), and California Rules of Court, rule 2.2 et seq., for
Dated: 1-9-12	MARK'S, ARNOLD
Dates	Judidal Officer
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	CE
I, the below named Executive Officer/Clerk of the above-entitled court herein, and that on this date I served the Notice of Case Management Re	rt, do hereby certify that I am not a party to the cause leview upon each party or counsel named below:
by depositing in the United States mail at the courthouse in filed herein in a separate sealed envelope to each address as shown	California, one copy of the original n below with the postage thereon fully prepaid.
by personally giving the party notice upon filing of the complaint.	
·	JOHN A. CLARKE, Executive Officer/Clerk
Dated: 1-9-12	by Book Clad
	Deputy Clerk
ACIV 133 (Rev. 01/08) NOTICE OF ASC Approved 10-03 CASE MANAGEMENT REVIEW —	Cal. Rules of Court, rules 3,720-3,730 LIMITED CIVIL LASC Local Rules, Chapter Seven

Copy - Party

Original - File

1	DROCK ROK1 I
2	1715 Via El Prado, Suite 744 Redondo Beach, California 90277
3	
4	Plaintiff in pro per
5	
6	
7	
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
9	SOUTHWEST DISTRICT
10	
11	BRUCE RORTY,) CASE NO. SB 12C00075
12	Plaintiff,) Assigned for All Purposes to the Hon. Laura C. Ellison, Judge, Dept. A
13	vs.) NOTICE OF REASSIGNMENT TO
14 15	CITICORP, , a Delaware corporation, et) DEPARTMENT A
16	Defendants.
17	-
18	TO DEFENDANT CITICORP, a Delaware corporation:
19	PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that effective May 18, 2012, this matter has been reassigned to
20	Department A.
21	DATED 1 10 2010
22	DATED: June 18, 2012 BRUCE RORTY
23	By: (Time For)
24	Bruce Rorty, Plaintiff in proper
25	Brase resign raintiti in proper
26	
27	
28	
	SDOC2/44407 -1
	NOTICE OF REASSIGNMENT OF MATTER TO DEPT. A.

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION (ADR) INFORMATION PACKAGE

[CRC 3.221 Information about Alternative Dispute Resolution]

For additional ADR information and forms visit the Court ADR web application at www.lasuperiorcourt.org (click on ADR).

The plaintiff shall serve a copy of this Information Package on each defendant along with the complaint (Civil only).

What is ADR:

Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) is the term used to describe all the other options available for settling a dispute which once had to be settled in court. ADR processes, such as arbitration, mediation, neutral evaluation (NE), and settlement conferences, are less formal than a court process and provide opportunities for parties to reach an agreement using a problem-solving approach.

There are many different kinds of ADR. All of them utilize a "neutral", an impartial person, to decide the case or help the parties reach an agreement.

Mediation:

In mediation, a neutral person called a "mediator" helps the parties try to reach a mutually acceptable resolution of the dispute. The mediator does not decide the dispute but helps the parties communicate so they can by to settle the dispute themselves. Mediation leaves control of the outcome with the parties.

Cases for Which Mediation May Be Appropriate

Mediation may be particularly useful when parties have a dispute between or among family members, neighbors, or business partners. Mediation is also effective when emotions are getting in the way of resolution. An effective mediator can hear the parties out and help them communicate with each other in an effective and nondestructive manner.

Cases for Which Mediation May Not Be Appropriate

Mediation may not be effective if one of the parties is unwilling to cooperate or compromise. Mediation also may not be effective if one of the parties has a significant advantage in power over the other. Therefore, it may not be a good choice if the parties have a history of abuse or victimization.

Arbitration:

In arbitration, a neutral person called an "arbitrator" hears arguments and evidence from each side and then decides the outcome of the dispute. Arbitration is less formal than a trial, and the rules of evidence are often relaxed. Arbitration may be either "binding" or "nonbinding." Binding arbitration means that the parties waive their right to a trial and agree to accept the arbitrator's decision as final. Nonbinding arbitration means that the parties are free to request a trial if they do not accept the arbitrator's decision.

Cases for Which Arbitration May Be Appropriate

Arbitration is best for cases where the parties want another person to decide the outcome of their dispute for them but would like to avoid the formality, time, and expense of a trial. It may also be appropriate for complex matters where the parties want a decision-maker who has training or experience in the subject matter of the dispute.

Cases for Which Arbitration May Not Be Appropriate

If parties want to retain control over how their dispute is resolved, arbitration, particularly binding arbitration, is not appropriate. In binding arbitration, the parties generally cannot appeal the arbitrator's award, even if it is not supported by the evidence or the law. Even in nonbinding arbitration, if a party requests a trial and does not receive a more favorable result at trial than in arbitration, there may be penalties.

Neutral Evaluation:

In neutral evaluation, each party gets a chance to present the case to a neutral person called an "evaluator." The evaluator then gives an opinion on the strengths and weaknesses of each party's evidence and arguments and about how the dispute could be resolved. The evaluator is often an expert in the subject matter of the dispute. Although the evaluator's opinion is not binding, the parties typically use it as a basis for trying to negotiate a resolution of the dispute.

Cases for Which Neutral Evaluation May Be Appropriate

Neutral evaluation may be most appropriate in cases in which there are technical issues that require special expertise to resolve or the only significant issue in the case is the amount of damages.

Cases for Which Neutral Evaluation May Not Be Appropriate

Neutral evaluation may not be appropriate when there are significant personal or emotional barriers to resolving the dispute.

Settlement Conferences:

Settlement conferences may be either mandatory or voluntary. In both types of settlement conferences, the parties and their attorneys meet with a judge or a neutral person called a "settlement officer" to discuss possible settlement of their dispute. The judge or settlement officer does not make a decision in the case but assists the parties in evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of the case and in negotiating a settlement. Settlement conferences are appropriate in any case where settlement is an option. Mandatory settlement conferences are often held close to the date a case is set for trial.

LAADR 005 (Rev. 05/09) LASC Approved 10-03 Page 1 of 2

LOS ANGELES SUPERIOR COURT ADR PROGRAMS

CIVIL:

- Civil Action Mediation (Governed by Code of Civil Procedure (CCP) sections 1775-1775.15, Celifornia Rules of Court, rules 3.850-3.868 and 3.870-3.878, Evidence Code sections 1115-1128, and Los Angeles Superior Court Rules, chapter 12.)
- Retired Judge Settlement Conference
- Neutral Evaluation (Governed by Los Angelos Superior Court Rules, chapter 12.)
- Judicial Arbitration (Governed by Code of Civil Procedure sections 1141.10-1141.31, California Rules of Court, rules 3.810-3.830, and Los Angeles Superior Court Rules, chapter 12.)
- Eminent Domain Mediation (Governed by Code of Civil Procedure section 1250,420.)
- Civil Harassment Mediation
- Small Claims Mediation

FAMILY LAW (non-custody):

- Mediation
- Forensic Certified Public Accountant (CPA) Settlement Conference
- · Settlement Conference
- Nonbinding Arbitration (Governed by Family Code section 2554.)

PROBATE:

- Mediation
- . Settlement Conference

NEUTRAL SELECTION

Parties may select a mediator, neutral evaluator, or arbitrator from the Court Party Select Panel or may hire someone privately, at their discretion. If the parties utilize the Random Select Mediation or Arbitration Panel, the parties will be assigned on a random basis the name of one neutral who meets the case criteria entered on the court's website.

COURT ADR PANELS

Party Select

Panel

The Party Select Panel consists of mediators, neutral evaluators, and arbitrators who have achieved a specified level of experience in court-connected cases. The parties (collectively) may be charged \$150.00 per hour for the first three hours of hearing time. Thereafter, the parties may be charged for additional hearing time on an hourly basis at rates established by the neutral if the parties consent in writing.

Random Select

Panel

The Random Select Panel consists of trained mediators, neutral evaluators, and arbitrators who have not yet gained the experience to qualify for the Party Select Panel, as well as experienced neutrals who make themselves evallable pro bono as a way of supporting the judicial system. It is the policy of the Court that all Random Select Panel volunteer mediators, neutral evaluators, and arbitrators provide three hours hearing time per case. Thereafter, the parties may be charged for additional hearing time on an hourly basis at rates established by the neutral if the parties consent in writing.

Private Neutral

The market rate for private neutrals can range from \$300-\$1,000 per hour.

ADR ASSISTANCE

For assistance regarding ADR, please contact the ADR derk at the courthouse in which your case was filed.

EDBHIRORS	STANDARD STANDARD	MOONE	ACITY COLUMN TO THE	INPHONE AND POLY	NEW WILLIAM
Antonovich	42011, 4th St. West	None.	Lançaster, CA 93534	(661)974-7275	(661)974-7060
Chatsworth	9425 Penfield Ave.	1200	Chaisworth, CA 91311	(818)576-8565	(818)576-8687
Compton	200 W. Compton Blvd.	1602	Compton, CA 90220	(310)603-3072	(310)223-0337
Glendale '	600 E. Broadway	273	Glendale, CA 91298	(818)500-3160	(818)548-5470
Long Beach.	415 W. Ocean Blvd.	316	Long-Beach, CA 90802	(582)491-6272	(562)437-3602
Norwalk	12720 Nopwalk Blvd.	308	Norwalk, CA 90650	(562)807-7243	(562)462-9019
Pasadena	300 E. Walnut St.	109	Pasadena CA 91101	(626)356-5685	(626)666-1774
Pomona	400 Civic Center Plaza	106	Pomoda, GA 91766	(909)620-3183	(909)629-6283
San Pedro	505 S. Centre	209	San Pedro, CA: 90731	(310)519-8151	(310)514-0314
Santa Monka	1725 Main St.	203	Santa Monica, GA 96401	(310)260-1829	(310)319-6130
Stanley Mosk	111 N. HIII St.	113	Los Angeles, CR 90012	(213)974-5425	(213)633-5115
Torrance	825 Maple Ave.	100	Torrance, CA 90503	(340)222-1701	(310)782-7326
Van Nuys	6230 Sylmar Ave.	418	Van Nuys, CA 91401	(818)374-2337	(818)902-2440

Partially Funded by the Los Angeles County Dispute Resolution Program
A complete list of the County Dispute Resolution Programs is available online and upon request in the Clerk's Office

LAADR 005 (Rev. 05/09) LASC Approved 10-03

Page 2 of 2

VOLUNTARY EFFICIENT LITIGATION STIPULATIONS



Superior Court of California County of Los Angeles



Los Angeles County Bar Association Litigation Section

Los Angeles County Bar Association Labor and Employment Law Section



Consumer Attorneys
Association of Los Angeles



Southern California Defense Counsel





California Employment Lawyers Association

The Early Organizational Meeting Stipulation, Discovery Resolution Stipulation, and Motions in Limine Stipulation are voluntary stipulations entered into by the parties. The parties may enter into one, two, or all three of the stipulations; however, they may not alter the stipulations as written, because the Court wants to ensure uniformity of application. These stipulations are meant to encourage cooperation between the parties and to assist in resolving issues in a manner that promotes economic case resolution and judicial efficiency.

The following organizations endorse the goal of promoting efficiency in litigation and ask that counsel consider using these stipulations as a voluntary way to promote communications and procedures among counsel and with the court to fairly resolve issues in their cases.

- **♦**Los Angeles County Bar Association Litigation Section**♦**
 - ◆ Los Angeles County Bar Association
 Labor and Employment Law Section◆
 - **♦**Consumer Attorneys Association of Los Angeles**♦**
 - ◆Southern California Defense Counsel◆
 - ◆Association of Business Trial Lawyers ◆
 - ◆California Employment Lawyers Association◆

		
NAME AND ADDRESS OF ATTOMICEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTOMICEY:	STATE BAR MUNEER	Received for Clark's File Starep
·		
·	•	
TELEPHONE NO.: FAX E-MASL ADDRESS (Optional):	(NO. (Optional): `	
ATTORNEY FOR (Name):		
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,	COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES	
COURTHOUSE ADDRESS:		·
PLAINTIFF:		
DEFENDANT:		
		CASE NUMBER
STIPULATION EARLY ORGAN	IIZATIONAL MEETING	CANOC LANGUAGE
•		i

This stipulation is intended to encourage cooperation among the parties at an early stage in the litigation and to assist the parties in efficient case resolution.

The parties agree that:

- The parties commit to conduct an initial conference (in-person or via teleconference or via videoconference) within 15 days from the date this stipulation is signed, to discuss and consider whether there can be agreement on the following:
 - a. Are motions to challenge the pleadings necessary? If the issue can be resolved by amendment as of right, or if the Court would allow leave to amend, could an amended complaint resolve most or all of the issues a demurrer might otherwise raise? If so, the parties agree to work through pleading issues so that a demurrer need only raise issues they cannot resolve. Is the issue that the defendant seeks to raise amenable to resolution on demurrer, or would some other type of motion be preferable? Could a voluntary targeted exchange of documents or information by any party cure an uncertainty in the pleadings?
 - b. Initial mutual exchanges of documents at the "core" of the litigation. (For example, in an employment case, the employment records, personnel file and documents relating to the conduct in question could be considered "core." In a personal injury case, an incident or police report, medical records, and repair or maintenance records could be considered "core.");
 - c. Exchange of names and contact information of witnesses;
 - d. Any insurance agreement that may be available to satisfy part or all of a judgment, or to indemnify or reimburse for payments made to satisfy a judgment;
 - e. Exchange of any other information that might be helpful to facilitate understanding, handling, or resolution of the case in a manner that preserves objections or privileges by agreement;
 - f. Controlling issues of law that, if resolved early, will promote efficiency and economy in other phases of the case. Also, when and how such issues can be presented to the Court;
 - g. Whether or when the case should be scheduled with a settlement officer, what discovery or court ruling on legal issues is reasonably required to make settlement discussions meaningful, and whether the parties wish to use a sitting judge or a private mediator or other options as

LACIV 229 (new) LASC Approved 04/11

STIPULATION - EARLY ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

Page 1 of 2

SHORT TIT	v.	CASE KARGER			
h.	discussed in the "Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) complaint; Computation of damages, including documents not priving the computation of damages.				
	which such computation is based;				
l.	Whether the case is suitable for the Expedited Jury www.lasuperiorcourt.org under "Civii" and then under	Trial procedures (see information at "General Information").			
2.	The time for a defending party to respond to a complaint to for the complaint, and complaint, which is comprised of the 30 days to respond and the 30 days permitted by Code of Civil Procedure been found by the Civil Supervising Judge due to the citils Stipulation.	(INSERT DATE) for the cross- d under Government Code § 68616(b), e section 1054(e), good cause having			
3.					
4.	References to "days" mean calendar days, unless other any act pursuant to this stipulation falls on a Saturday, S for performing that act shall be extended to the next Cou	Sunday or Court holiday, then the time			
The fo	flowing parties stipulate:				
Date:	· •				
Date:	(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)	(ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF)			
Date:	(TYPE OR PRINT NAME) >	(ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT)			
Date:	(TYPE OR PRINT NAME) >	(ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT)			
Date:	(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)	(ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT)			
Date:	(TYPE OR PRINT NAME) (AT)	TORNEY FOR)			
Date:	(TYPE OR PRINT NAME) (ATT	ORNEY FOR)			
		ORNEY FOR)			
ACIV 22	STIPULATION - FARLY ORGANIZAT	TONAL MEETING .			

NAME AND ADDRESS OF ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY	REBULIN NAS STATE	Reserved for Clark's File Stemp
,	,	
·		
	· .	ب
TELEPHONE NO.: FAX NO. (Op E-MAIL ADDRESS (Optional): ATTORNEY FOR (Name):	•	
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COU	NTY OF LOS ANGELES	
COURTHOUSE ADDRESS:		,
PLAINTIFF:		
DEFENDANT:		
STIPULATION - DISCOVERY RE	SOLUTION	CASE NUMBER:

This stipulation is intended to provide a fast and informal resolution of discovery issues through limited paperwork and an informal conference with the Court to aid in the resolution of the issues.

The parties agree that:

- Prior to the discovery cut-off in this action, no discovery motion shall be filed or heard unless the moving party first makes a written request for an informal Discovery Conference pursuant to the terms of this stipulation.
- At the Informal Discovery Conference the Court will consider the dispute presented by parties
 and determine whether it can be resolved informally. Nothing set forth herein will preclude a
 party from making a record at the conclusion of an Informal Discovery Conference, either
 orally or in writing.
- 3. Following a reasonable and good faith attempt at an informal resolution of each issue to be presented, a party may request an informal Discovery Conference pursuant to the following procedures:
 - a. The party requesting the Informal Discovery Conference will:
 - File a Request for Informal Discovery Conference with the clerk's office on the approved form (copy attached) and deliver a courtesy, conformed copy to the assigned department;
 - ii. Include a brief summary of the dispute and specify the relief requested; and
 - iii. Serve the opposing party pursuant to any authorized or agreed method of service that ensures that the opposing party receives the Request for Informal Discovery Conference no later than the next court day following the filing.
 - b. Any Answer to a Request for Informal Discovery Conference must:
 - Also be filed on the approved form (copy attached);
 - ii. Include a brief summary of why the requested relief should be denied;

LACIV 036 (new) LASC Approved 04/11

STIPULATION - DISCOVERY RESOLUTION

Page 1 of 3

	•		CASE MAGNER
SHORT THE		•	
		1	

- iii. Be filed within two (2) court days of receipt of the Request; and
- Iv. Be served on the opposing party pursuant to any authorized or agreed upon method of service that ensures that the opposing party receives the Answer no later than the next court day following the filing.
- c. No other pleadings, including but not limited to exhibits, declarations, or attachments, will be accepted.
- d. If the Court has not granted or denied the Request for Informal Discovery Conference within ten (10) days following the filing of the Request, then it shall be deemed to have been denied. If the Court acts on the Request, the parties will be notified whether the Request for Informal Discovery Conference has been granted or denied and, if granted, the date and time of the Informal Discovery Conference, which must be within twenty (20) days of the filing of the Request for Informal Discovery Conference.
- e. If the conference is not held within twenty (20) days of the filing of the Request for Informal Discovery Conference, unless extended by agreement of the parties and the Court, then the Request for the Informal Discovery Conference shall be deemed to have been denied at that time.
- 4. If (a) the Court has denied a conference or (b) one of the time deadlines above has expired without the Court having acted or (c) the Informal Discovery Conference is concluded without resolving the dispute, then a party may file a discovery motion to address unresolved issues.
- 5. The parties hereby further agree that the time for making a motion to compel or other discovery motion is tolled from the date of filing of the Request for Informal Discovery Conference until (a) the request is denied or deemed denied or (b) twenty (20) days after the filing of the Request for Informal Discovery Conference, whichever is earlier, unless extended by Order of the Court.
 - It is the understanding and intent of the parties that this stipulation shall, for each discovery dispute to which it applies, constitute a writing memorializing a "specific later date to which the propounding [or demanding or requesting] party and the responding party have agreed in writing," within the meaning of Code Civil Procedure sections 2030.300(c), 2031.320(c), and 2033.290(c).
- 6. Nothing herein will preclude any party from applying ex parte for appropriate relief, including an order shortening time for a motion to be heard concerning discovery.
- 7. Any party may terminate this stipulation by giving twenty-one (21) days notice of intent to terminate the stipulation.
- 8. References to "days" mean calendar days, unless otherwise noted. If the date for performing any act pursuant to this stipulation falls on a Saturday, Sunday or Court holiday, then the time for performing that act shall be extended to the next Court day.

LACIV 036 (new) LASC Approved 04/11

SHORT TITLE			CASE MUNICA:
<u> </u>			
T' E. 11	in the second second of the second of	, .	
ine ion	lowing parties stipulate:		
Date:			
		_	
Date:	(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)		(ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF)
	;	· >	
Date:	(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)		(ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT)
Date.	•	>	
D.A.Y.	(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)		(ATTORNEY FOR DEPENDANT)
Date:		>	
	(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)	·····	(ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT)
Date:	•	A	•
**************************************	(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)		(ATTORNEY FOR
Date:	•	b	
	(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)		(ATTORNEY FOR
Date:			
	(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)		(ATTORNEY FOR
	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		

LACIV 038 (new) LASC Approved 04/11

NAME AND ACCRESS OF ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY:	STATE SAN HUMBER	Reserved for Clarif's File Starup
		·
		•
·	•	
TELEPHONE NO.: FAX NO. (OP	otional);	
E-MAIL ADDRESS (Optional): ATTORNEY FOR (Name):		
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUR	NTY OF LOS ANGELES	
COURTHOUSE ADDRESS:		
PLAINTIFF;		•
DEFENDANT:	,	•
		CASE NUMBER:
STIPULATION AND ORDER – MOTI	ONS IN LIMINE	·

This stipulation is intended to provide fast and informal resolution of evidentiary issues through diligent efforts to define and discuss such issues and limit paperwork.

The parties agree that:

- 1. At least ____ days before the final status conference, each party will provide all other parties with a list containing a one paragraph explanation of each proposed motion in limine. Each one paragraph explanation must identify the substance of a single proposed motion in limine and the grounds for the proposed motion.
- 2. The parties thereafter will meet and confer, either in person or via teleconference or videoconference, concerning all proposed motions in limine. In that meet and confer, the parties will determine:
 - a. Whether the parties can stipulate to any of the proposed motions. If the parties so stipulate, they may file a stipulation and proposed order with the Court.
 - b. Whether any of the proposed motions can be briefed and submitted by means of a short joint statement of issues. For each motion which can be addressed by a short joint statement of issues must be filed with the Court 10 days prior to the final status conference. Each side's portion of the short joint statement of issues may not exceed three pages. The parties will meet and confer to agree on a date and manner for exchanging the parties' respective portions of the short joint statement of issues and the process for filing the short joint statement of issues.
- All proposed motions in limine that are not either the subject of a stipulation or briefed via a short joint statement of issues will be briefed and filed in accordance with the California Rules of Court and the Los Angeles Superior Court Rules.

LACIV 075 (new) 'LASC Approved 04/11

STIPULATION AND ORDER - MOTIONS IN LIMINE

Page 1 of 2

BHOKY TWLE		CASE MOUSER	
The fo	ollowing parties stipulate:		
Date:	•	•	
Date:	(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)	(ATTORNEY FOR P	_AINTIFF)
	(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)	(ATTORNEY FOR DE	FENDANTI
Date:	(,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	> ×	
Date:	(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)	(ATTORNEY FOR DE	FENDANT)
•	(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)	(ATTORNEY FOR DE	FENDANT)
Date:		> ·	
Date:	(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)	(ATTORNEY FOR	
	(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)	>	
Date:		>	
	(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)	(ATTÓRNEY FOR	
THE C	OURT SO ORDERS.	•	
Date:	P-04		
	•	JUDICIAL OFFIC	ER

LACIV 075 (new) LASC Approved 04/11

STIPULATION AND ORDER - MOTIONS IN LIMINE

Page 2 of 2

AND SHAPE	DORESS OF ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY:	STATE		Ì	Reserved for De	C S Care desirab
		<u> </u>				
			•		•	
	TELEPHONE NO.: FAX:	NO. (Optional):				
E-MAIL A	DDRESS (Optionel): RNEY FOR (Name):					
SUPE	RIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, C	COUNTY	OF LOS AND	GELES		
COURTHO	DUSE ADDRESS:					
LAINTIFF			······································			
			-			
DEFENDA	NT:					•
·	INFORMAL DISCOVERY	ONEED	ENCE	CAS	E MUMBER:	
	(pursuant to the Discovery Resolution S			l		
1.	This document relates to:			······································		
	Request for Informal Disco	very Con	ference			
^	Answer to Request for Info	ormal Disc	overy Confere	ence		
2.	Deadline for Court to decide on Require Request).	Jest:	1	(Insert date 10	calendar days fo	dlowing filling
3,	Deadline for Court to hold informal D	scovery (Conference:		(insert di	ate 20 calend
	days following filing of the Request).	_				
4				netiv descri	de the nati	ire of the
4,	For a Request for Informal Disc	overy Co	logal assum	anda at lase	a Easas	A
4.	discovery dispute, including the f	facts and	legal argum	ents at issu	e. For an	Answer t
4,	discovery dispute, including the f Request for informal Discovery Go	facts and onference	legal argum briefly des	ents at issu cribe why t	ie. For an . he Court sh	Answer to
4.	discovery dispute, including the f	facts and onference	legal argum briefly des, <u>briefly</u>	ents at issu cribe why t	ie. For an . he Court sh	Answer to
4.	discovery dispute, including the f Request for informal Discovery Go	facts and onference	legal argum briefly des, <u>briefly</u>	ents at issu cribe why t	ie. For an . he Court sh	Answer to
4.	discovery dispute, including the f Request for informal Discovery Go	facts and onference	legal argum briefly des, <u>briefly</u>	ents at issu cribe why t	ie. For an . he Court sh	Answer to
4.	discovery dispute, including the f Request for informal Discovery Go	facts and onference	legal argum briefly des, <u>briefly</u>	ents at issu cribe why t	ie. For an . he Court sh	Answer to
4.	discovery dispute, including the f Request for informal Discovery Go	facts and onference	legal argum briefly des, <u>briefly</u>	ents at issu cribe why t	ie. For an . he Court sh	Answer t
4.	discovery dispute, including the f Request for informal Discovery Go	facts and onference	legal argum briefly des, <u>briefly</u>	ents at issu cribe why t	ie. For an . he Court sh	Answer to
4.	discovery dispute, including the f Request for informal Discovery Go	facts and onference	legal argum briefly des, <u>briefly</u>	ents at issu cribe why t	ie. For an . he Court sh	Answer to
4.	discovery dispute, including the f Request for informal Discovery Go	facts and onference	legal argum briefly des, <u>briefly</u>	ents at issu cribe why t	ie. For an . he Court sh	Answer t
4.	discovery dispute, including the f Request for informal Discovery Go	facts and onference	legal argum briefly des, <u>briefly</u>	ents at issu cribe why t	ie. For an . he Court sh	Answer t
4.	discovery dispute, including the f Request for informal Discovery Go	facts and onference	legal argum briefly des, <u>briefly</u>	ents at issu cribe why t	ie. For an . he Court sh	Answer t
4.	discovery dispute, including the f Request for informal Discovery Go	facts and onference	legal argum briefly des, <u>briefly</u>	ents at issu cribe why t	ie. For an . he Court sh	Answer t
4.	discovery dispute, including the f Request for informal Discovery Go	facts and onference	legal argum briefly des	ents at issu cribe why t	ie. For an . he Court sh	Answer t
4.	discovery dispute, including the f Request for informal Discovery Go	facts and onference	legal argum briefly des	ents at issu cribe why t	ie. For an . he Court sh	Answer t
4.	discovery dispute, including the f Request for informal Discovery Go	facts and onference	legal argum briefly des	ents at issu cribe why t	ie. For an . he Court sh	Answer t
4.	discovery dispute, including the f Request for Informal Discovery Co the requested discovery, including	facts and onference the facts	legal argume, <u>briefly</u> des and legal arg	ents at issu cribe why ti guments at i	e. For an he Court sh	Answer t
4.	discovery dispute, including the f Request for Informal Discovery Co the requested discovery, including	facts and onference the facts	legal argum briefly des	ents at issu cribe why ti guments at i	e. For an he Court sh	Answer t
4.	discovery dispute, including the f Request for Informal Discovery Co the requested discovery, including	facts and onference the facts	legal argume, <u>briefly</u> des and legal arg	ents at issu cribe why t guments at i	e. For an he Court sh	Answer t
4.	discovery dispute, including the f Request for Informal Discovery Co the requested discovery, including	facts and onference the facts	legal argume, <u>briefly</u> des and legal arg	ents at issu cribe why t guments at i	e. For an he Court sh	Answer to
4.	discovery dispute, including the f Request for Informal Discovery Co the requested discovery, including	facts and onference the facts	legal argume, <u>briefly</u> des and legal arg	ents at issu cribe why t guments at i	e. For an he Court sh	Answer to
4.	discovery dispute, including the f Request for informal Discovery Co the requested discovery, including	facts and onference the facts	legal argume, <u>briefly</u> des and legal arg	ents at issu cribe why t guments at i	e. For an he Court sh	Answer to
	discovery dispute, including the f Request for informal Discovery Co the requested discovery, including	facts and onference the facts	legal argume, <u>briefly</u> des and legal arg	ents at issu cribe why t guments at i	e. For an he Court sh	Answer to

LACIV 084 (new) LASC Approved 04/11 INFORMAL DISCOVERY CONFERENCE (pursuant to the Discovery Resolution Stipulation of the parties)

		CONFORMED COMY
1	STROOCK & STROOCK & LAVAN LLP	OF ORIGINAL FILED Los Angeles Superior Court
2	JULIA B. STRICKLAND (State Bar No. 083013) MARCOS D. SASSO (State Bar No. 228905)	
3	A.R. KACHADOORIÀN (State Bar No. 240601) 2029 Century Park East, 16th Floor	John A. Clarke, Executive Officer/Clerk
4	Los Angeles, California 90067-3086 Telephone: 310-556-5800	By Lanelle M. Galindo, Deputy
5	Facsimile: 310-556-5959	
6	Attorneys for Defendants CITICORP CREDIT SERVICES, INC. (USA), CITICORP	and
7		
8		E STATE OF CALIFORNIA
9	FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANG	SELES – SOUTHWEST DISTRICT
10		
11	BRUCE RORTY,)	Case No. 12C00075
12	Plaintiff,)	[Assigned to the Hon. Laura C. Ellison, Dept. A]
13	v.)	ANSWER OF DEFENDANTS CITICORP
14	CITICORP, a Delaware corporation; and DOES) 1 to 20,	CREDIT SERVICES, INC. (USA) AND CITICORP TO COMPLAINT
15	Defendants.	Action Filed: January 9, 2012
16		Trial Date: None Set
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		•
25		
26		
27		
28		
	ANSWER TO	COMPLAINT Exh. B, Page 25
	LA 51600605	EAT. 5, 1 ago 20

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28





Defendants Citicorp Credit Services, Inc. (USA) and Citicorp (together, "Defendants") hereby answer the Complaint filed by plaintiff Bruce Rorty ("Plaintiff") and respond and allege as follows:

GENERAL DENIAL

Pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 431.30(d), Defendants deny, generally and specifically, in the conjunctive and disjunctive, each and every cause of action and allegation contained within the Complaint, and the Complaint as a whole, and further deny that the relief requested by Plaintiff is appropriate and/or that damages were sustained, or that Defendants' conduct was objectionable or unreasonable, or that Defendants were negligent in any way.

Defendants further deny that by reason of any act, fault, carelessness or omission on its part, Plaintiff have been injured, damaged or harmed in any way or in any amount whatsoever, or at all, by reason of any acts or omissions of Defendants.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

FAILURE TO STATE A CAUSE OF ACTION

(To All Causes Of Action)

1. The Complaint, and each claim and/or cause of action set forth therein, is barred, in whole or in part, on the grounds that the Complaint fails to set forth facts sufficient to state a cause of action against Defendants.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

AGREEMENT TO ARBITRATE

(To All Causes Of Action)

2. The Complaint, and each claim and cause of action set forth therein, is barred, in whole or in part, on the grounds that the credit card agreement governing Plaintiff's credit card account at issue (the "Account") contains a valid and binding arbitration provision that authorizes either party to elect arbitration of any claims pertaining the Account. Defendants reserve their right to elect arbitration of this dispute pursuant to such arbitration agreement.

-1-

os Angeles, California 90067-3086

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28





THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

ESTOPPEL

(To All Causes Of Action)

3. The Complaint, and each cause of action alleged therein, is barred by the conduct, actions and inactions of Plaintiff, which amount to and constitute an estoppel of the causes of action and any relief sought thereby.

FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

UNCLEAN HANDS

(To All Causes Of Action)

4. Plaintiff may obtain no relief under the Complaint by reason of the doctrine of unclean hands.

FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS

(To All Causes Of Action)

5. Plaintiff's causes of action against Defendants, as set forth in the Complaint, are barred by the applicable statutes of limitation including, without limitation, Cal. Civ. Code section 1783, Cal. Civ. Proc. Code Sections 335, 338, 339 and 340, and 28 U.S.C. § 1658.

SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

LACHES

(To All Causes Of Action)

6. Plaintiff unreasonably have delayed taking action in connection with the alleged claims, causing substantial prejudice to Defendants, and such claims therefore are barred pursuant to the doctrine of laches.

SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

FAILURE TO MITIGATE

(To All Causes Of Action)

7. Although Defendants deny that Plaintiff has suffered any harm as alleged in the Complaint, to the extent that Plaintiff has suffered harm, he has failed to mitigate that harm.

-2-

EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

COMPARATIVE NEGLIGENCE

(To All Causes Of Action)

8. Defendants deny any legal responsibility for Plaintiff's alleged damages; however, to the extent that Defendants are found to be legally responsible, Defendants' legal responsibility is not the sole and proximate cause of Plaintiff's alleged injuries, and any damages awarded to Plaintiff are to be apportioned in accordance with the fault and legal responsibility, if any, of all parties, persons and entities who contributed to and/or caused said damages.

NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

CONTRIBUTORY NEGLIGENCE

(To All Causes Of Action)

9. Plaintiff failed to exercise reasonable and ordinary care, caution or prudence in order to avoid incurring the damages sought by the Complaint; thus, the damages, if any, sustained by Plaintiff were proximately caused and contributed to by the negligence of Plaintiff.

TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

WAIVER

(To All Causes Of Action)

10. The Complaint, and each cause of action alleged therein, is barred by the conduct, actions and inactions of Plaintiff, which amount to and constitute a waiver of any right or rights that Plaintiff may or might have in relation to the matters alleged in the Complaint.

ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

INDEPENDENT/INTERVENING CONDUCT

(To All Causes Of Action)

11. Any damage sustained by Plaintiff was the direct and proximate result of the independent, intervening, negligent and unlawful conduct of independent third parties or their agents, and not any act or omission on the part of Defendants.

- 3 -

1	TWELFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
2	RATIFICATION
3	(To All Causes Of Action)
4	12. The Complaint is barred, in whole or in part, by the conduct, actions and inactions
5	of Plaintiff under the doctrine of ratification.
6	THIRTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
7	FEDERAL PREEMPTION
8	(To All Causes Of Action)
9	13. The Complaint, and each claim and cause of action set forth therein, is barred, in
10	whole or in part, by the doctrine of federal preemption.
11	FOURTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
12	OFFSET
13	(To All Causes Of Action)
14	14. The Complaint, and each claim and cause of action set forth therein, is barred, in
15	whole or in part, on the grounds that Defendants assert that they are entitled to an offset of any
16	damages claimed by Plaintiff based on any amount owing on the Account.
17	FIFTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
18	CHOICE OF LAW
19	(To All Causes Of Action)
20	15. The Complaint, and each claim and cause of action set forth therein, is barred, in
21	whole or in part, to the extent it is based on law other than the governing law contained in the
22	parties' credit card agreement.
23	SIXTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
24	NOT CHARGED
25	(To All Causes Of Action)
26	16. Plaintiff's claims are barred to the extent he was not charged for any calls allegedly
27	placed to any cell phone number.
28	- 4 -
	ANSWER TO COMPLAINT Exh. B, Page 29
	LA 51600605



1 SEVENTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 2 **DUE PROCESS** 3 (To All Causes Of Action) 4 17. The imposition of liability and/or statutory damages as sought in the Complaint 5 would violate provisions of the United States Constitution, including the Due Process Clause. 6 EIGHTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 7 NOT KNOWING OR WILLFUL 8 (To The Third Cause of Action) 9 18. Plaintiff is precluded from any recovery from CCSI (USA) for any alleged willful 10 and knowing violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227 (the "TCPA") 11 because any such violation (which Defendants deny occurred) would not have been willful or 12 knowing. 13 NINETEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 14 **CONSENT** 15 (To The Third Cause of Action) 16 19. Defendants are informed and believe, and on that basis allege, that Plaintiff is 17 barred, in whole or in part, from maintaining his alleged cause of action because "prior express consent" was provided within the meaning of the TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A), for all calls 18 19 allegedly placed to Plaintiff's cell phone number by any alleged automatic telephone dialing 20 system. 21 TWENTIETH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 22 IMPROPER CAUSE OF ACTION 23 (To The Third Cause of Action) 24 20. Plaintiff's claim for violation of California's Consumer Legal Remedies Act, Civil 25 Code Sections 1750 through 1784 ("CLRA"), fails as a matter of law. See Berry v. Am. Express 26 Publ'g, Inc., 147 Cal. App. 4th 224, 229 (2007) (holding that neither a credit card nor the 27 "extension of credit" are goods or services under the CLRA). In addition, any claim for damages

28





based on a violation of the CLRA is barred because Plaintiff failed to provide adequate and timely 1 2 written notice pursuant to California Civil Code Section 1782(a) prior to filing the Complaint. 3 TWENTY-FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE RESERVATION OF RIGHT TO ASSERT OTHER DEFENSES 4 5 21. Defendants expressly reserve the right to assert such other and further affirmative 6 defenses as may be appropriate. 7 WHEREFORE, Defendants pray for judgment as follows: 8 1. That Plaintiff take nothing by the Complaint: 9 2. That the Complaint be dismissed with prejudice; 10 3. That Defendants recover their attorneys' fees, expenses and costs herein, as allowed STROOCK & STROOCK & LAVAN LUP for under any applicable law; and 11 2029 Century Park East, Suite 1800 Los Angeles, California 90067-3086 12 For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper. 4. 13 Dated: November 15, 2012 STROOCK & STROOCK & LAVAN LLP 14 JULIA B. STRICKLAND MARCOS D. SASSO 15 A.R. KACHADOORIAN 16 17 A.R. Kachadoorian 18 Attorneys for Defendants 19 CITICORP CREDIT SERVICES, INC. (USA) and CITICORP 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27

- 6 -

28

A 51600605

Case 2:12-cv-09835-FMO-FFM Document 1 Filed 11/16/12 Page 34 of 38 Page ID #:34

Case	2:12-cv-09835-FMO-FFM Document 1 Filed 11/16/12 Page 35 of 38 Page ID #:35
1	PROOF OF SERVICE
2	STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
3	COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES) ss
4	
5	I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California, over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to the within action. My business address is: 2029 Century Park East, Suite 1800, Los Angeles, California 90067-3086.
6	11
7 8	On November 16, 2012, I served the foregoing document(s) described as: NOTICE OF REMOVAL on the interested parties in this action by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope addressed as follows:
	Bruce Rorty.
9	1715 Via El Prado, Suite 744 Redondo Beach, California 90277
11	(VIA PERSONAL SERVICE) By causing to be delivered the document(s) listed above to the person(s) at the address(es) set forth
12	above.
13	(VIA U.S. MAIL) In accordance with the regular mailing collection and
14	processing practices of this office, with which I am readily familiar, by means of which mail is deposited with the United States Postal Service at
15	Los Angeles, California that same day in the ordinary course of business, I deposited such sealed envelope, with postage thereon fully prepaid, for collection and mailing on this same date following ordinary business practices, addressed as set forth below.
Suite 1800 3067-3086 14 21 3086	(VIA FACSIMILE) By causing such document to be delivered to the office of the addressee via facsimile.
2029 Century Park East, Suite 1800 Los Angeles, California 90067-3086 12 18 19 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	(VIA OVERNIGHT DELIVERY) By causing such envelope to be delivered to the office of the addressee(s) at the address(es) set forth above by overnight delivery via Federal Express or by a similar overnight
Sentur geles,	delivery service.
702 For Pros Pros Pros Pros Pros Pros Pros Pr	I declare that I am employed in the office of a member of the bar of this court
22	whose direction the service was made.
23	I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.
24	Executed on November 16, 2012, at Los Angeles, California.
25	
26	Lori A. Reed for a learn
27	[Type or Print Name] // [Signature]
28	

NOTICE OF REMOVAL

LA 51600594

STROOCK & STROOCK & LAVAN LLP

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NOTICE OF ASSIGNMENT TO UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE FOR DISCOVERY

This case has been assigned to District Judge George King and the assigned discovery Magistrate Judge is Frederick F. Mumm.

The case number on all documents filed with the Court should read as follows:

CV12- 9835 GHK (FFMx)

Pursuant to General Order 05-07 of the United States District Court for the Central District of California, the Magistrate Judge has been designated to hear discovery related motions.

All discovery related mo	otions should be noticed on the cale	ndar of the Magistrate Judge
	THE OPEN THE PARTY WAS ARREST THE PARTY WAS ARREST TO	ACTION CHARLE SLEVEN SHARE VALUE VALUE AND AND SHARE S
	NOTICE TO COUNSEL	
A copy of this notice must be se filed, a copy of this notice must	rved with the summons and complaint on a be served on all plaintiffs).	all defendants (if a removal action is
Subsequent documents must be	e filed at the following location:	
□ Western Division	「 1 Southern Division	「 1 Eastern Division

Failure to file at the proper location will result in your documents being returned to you.

411 West Fourth St., Rm. 1-053

Santa Ana, CA 92701-4516

3470 Twelfth St., Rm. 134

Riverside, CA 92501

312 N. Spring St., Rm. G-8

Los Angeles, CA 90012

	UNITED STATES DIST		URT, CEN		ICT OF CA	ALIFORNIA	1 (6.))
I (a) PLAINTIFFS (Check box if you are representing yourself)			D	DEFENDANTS			
Bruce Rorty				Citicorp and Citicorp Credit Services, Inc. (USA)			
(b) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address and Telephone Number. If you are representing yourself, provide same.) Bruce Rorty 1715 Via El Prado, Suite 744 Redondo Beach, CA 90277 (310) 375-0776			S Ju 20 L	Attorneys (If Known) Stroock & Stroock & Lavan LLP Julia B. Strickland/Marcos D. Sasso/A.Kachadoorian 2029 Century Park East, Suite 1600 Los Angeles, CA 90067 (310) 556-5800			
II. BASIS OF JURISDICT	ON (Place an X in one box only.)	III. CITIZ (Place	an X in one box for	plaintiff and o	FIES - For Diversity ne for defendant.)	•
1 U.S. Government Plaintif	f X 3 Federal Question Government Not a		Citizen of Th	is State TI	DEF Incor of Bu	porated or Principal isiness in this State	PTF DEF Place 4 4
2 U.S. Government Defend	ant 4 Diversity (Indicate of Parties in Item		Citizen of An	other State 2	2 Incor of Bu	porated and Principa siness in Another St	al Place 5 5 rate
			Citizen or Sul Foreign Co		3 Forei	gn Nation	<u> 6 6 </u>
	one box only.) oved from 3 Remanded fro Court Appellate Con		nstated or opened	5 Transferred fro (specify):	m another distr	ict 6 Multi- District Litigati	
laintiff alleges that Def	P. 23: Yes X No Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under violated the fed ace an X in one box only.)		filing and wri	te a brief statement	of cause. Do no		
OTHER STATUTES 400 State Reapportionment 410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce/ICC Rates/etc. 460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit 490 Cable/Sat TV 810 Selective Service 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410 X 890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Act 892 Economic Stabilization Act 893 Environmental Matters 894 Energy Allocation Act 895 Freedom of Info. Act 900 Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice	CONTRACT 110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loan (Excl. Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability	310 Airr Liai 315 Airr Liai 320 Ass Slai 330 Fed Lial 340 Mai 345 Mai 355 Moi 355 Moi 360 Oth Inju 362 Pers Proces 368 Asb Inju Liat 3462 Nath App	ALINJURY plane plane Product bility sault, Libel & nder i. Employers' bility rine rine Product bility tor Vehicle tor Vehicle duct Liability er Personal	TORTS PERSONA PROPERT 370 Other Fra 371 Truth in I 380 Other Per Property 385 Property Product I 422 Appeal 2: 158 423 Withdraw USC 157 CIVIL RIGH 441 Voting 442 Employm 443 Housing/ mmodatic 444 Welfare 445 American Disabilitic Employm 446 American Disabilitic Other 440 Other Civ	Accoons with ess- with ess- and Lending roonal	PRISONER PETITIONS 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence Habeas Corpus 535 Death Penalty 540 Mandamus/ Other 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition FORFEITURE/ PENALTY 510 Agriculture 520 Other Food & Drug 525 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 530 Liquor Laws 540 R.R. & Truck 550 Airline Regs 560 Occupational Safety/Health 590 Other	LABOR 710 Fair Labor Standards Act 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations 730 Labor/Mgmt. Reporting & Disclosure Act 740 Railway Labor Act 790 Other Labor Litigation 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act PROPERTY RIGHTS 820 Copyrights 830 Patent 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY 861 HIA (1395ff) 862 Black Lung (923) 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) 864 SSID Title XVI 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or
950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	290 All Other Real Property	Alie	n Detainee er Immigration	Rights			Defendant) 871 IRS - Third Party

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Case Number:

AFTER COMPLETING THE FRONT SIDE OF FORM CV-71, COMPLETE THE INFORMATION REQUESTED BELOW.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

CIVIL COVER SHEET Page 2 of 2